UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,456	10/16/2003	Hideki Kawai	Q77945	5429

23373	7590	07/20/2006

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER
HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 07/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 April 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-79</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>6,8-10,33,34,42-44,48,50-52,75 and 76</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5,7,11-32,35-41,45-47,49,53-74 and 77-79</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>16 October 2003</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20031016</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Species I in the reply filed on 04/20/2006 is acknowledged.

Claims 6, 8-10, 33,34, 42-44, 48, 50-52, 75 and 76 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 04/20/2006.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code (see Page 1, Line 26). Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

The Specification of the present invention appears to be a literal translation of Japanese Patent Application Serial No. 2002-302585. Therefore, most of the Specification is not written in idiomatic English and does not conform to United States patent practice.

For example, the paragraph on Page 1, Lines 11-15 reads:

"The present invention relates to an apparatus, method and computer

program product for checking *a hypertext*, and more particularly, to an

apparatus, method and computer program product for detecting *part of an error*

in a *link source description* and a relationship between links in *a hypertext*."

(emphasis added)

Another example includes the paragraph spanning Pages 1 and 2 reads as

follows:

"There is disclosed a first example of the conventional technology of

checking a hypertext targeting a hypertext on Internet, in nonpatent literature

on a link checker "LinkScan.TM." produced by Elsop.TM. (Electronic Software

Publishing Corporation), at URL:http:/www.elsop.com/- linkscan/ on Internet,

searched at Oct. 9, 2002. This is a tool that automatically goes around the

hypertexts over the Internet *to have a log recorded therein on the occasion of*

an error. There are some types of such link checker including one type of the

link checker that is adapted to *diagnose a target online in accordance with*

the specified address of the target, and the other type of the link checker that

is adapted to *diagnose folder offline* in accordance with the specified particular

folder in a hard disk." (emphasis added)

Another example includes the paragraph spanning Pages 2 and 3, which reads:

"There is a third example of the conventional technology of a typical system for checking a document including a document correcting system such as an auto-correcting function in Microsoft ® Word produced by Microsoft Corporation. These document correcting systems are operable to detect *an inappropriate expression such as an error of a declensional "Kana", which is a kind of Japanese character, ending and a repeat of a postpositional particle of Japanese*, and to then output a correction candidate." (emphasis added)

Simply stated, these portions of the Specification are not written in a manner that is understood by the examiner. That is, the text is not written in proper idiomatic English and does not conform to United States patent practice in that the text is written using terms that are not normally used in the United States to describe these types of inventions and the state of the art in the field of the present invention.

This manner of writing (i.e., improper idiomatic English and descriptions of the subject matter of the present invention that are difficult, if not impossible, to understand for a person of ordinary skill in the United States whose native language is English) is **replete** throughout the Specification. Examples include:

➤ "Example of each logical mismatches is described in detail in the followings with reference to the drawings." See Page 24, Lines 10-12.

➤ "Therefore the audience can access the document 116 for the introduction information of 'GX0011' according to expectation when the audience browses the

documents 111, 112, and 113, but the audience cannot access the document

116 when the audience browses the wrong document 114 against expectation."

See Page 24, Line 25 through Page 25, Line 2.

➤ "In this embodiment, the example of putting a link to an expired information

described above includes the link for the expired campaign, but is not limited to,

and may further include a mismatch caused by transferring an initial document

from an original address to another address and replacing this initial document

with another document at the original address. Furthermore, an original period

may be unlimited." See Page 26, Line 24 through Page 27, Line 3.

➤ "As shown in FIG. 5, the disunity in the link source descriptions means a

mismatch in case when there is a fluctuation caused by the disunited link source

descriptions." See Page 27, Lines 15-17.

➤ "As shown in FIG. 6, the disunity in the style of the link source description means

a mismatch in different views of the link, or different effects at the click on a link

button, for example, due to the different style or target attribute. In FIG. 6A, the

document 141 has four links 241, 242, 243, and 244, in three of which the target

attribute is specified as "_blank" so as to open a pop-up window to display the

page of the link target thereon. Therefore, the audience who browses the

document 141 as shown in FIG. 6B may browse the documents 142, 143, and

144 of the link targets of the links 241, 242, and 243 one after another, while

opening the document 141 displayed on the screen. The display of the page of

the link target on the pop-up window is often convenient to particularly browse

the collection of the links, in which the audience may browse one after another some documents of the different link targets while browsing the original document of the collection of the links. Meanwhile, no target attribute is specified in the link 244, thereby causing the documents to turn at the click on a link button. Therefore, because the documents turn at the click on the link 244, the audience should look for a link to return the original document 141, or use a return button of the browser." See Page 28, Line 13 through Page 29, Line 6.

➢ "Suppose that the link target "HIDDEN_URL" is indicative of a confidential file such as a customer list, the information stored in the confidential file can be easily acquired by the crawler, while there is a danger of causing the trouble which is that a human being can not notice this leakage." See Page 30, Lines 3-7.

The examiner could provide many more examples of improper idiomatic English throughout the Specification.

To obviate this objection, Applicant should go through the entire specification – word-by-word, sentence-by-sentence, paragraph-by-paragraph – and rewrite the entire specification so that it: 1) reads easily for, and is easily understood by, a person whose native language is English; 2) consistently uses terminology – **used in the United States** – that is generally accepted in the art; and 3) conforms to United States patent practice.

A substitute specification in proper idiomatic English and in compliance with 37 CFR 1.52(a) and (b) is required. The substitute specification filed must be accompanied by a statement that it contains no new matter.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase "122, 122 and 123" on Page 26, Line 15 should be amended to — 121, 122 and 123 — because it appears to include a typographic error.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: "a hypertext on a Web site to be checked target" (see Claim 36, Line 2).

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because:

- in Figure 16, the term "MOMED" should be amended to — MOVED — because it appears to be a typographic error.

- in Figure 21, the term "EXTARCT" should be amended to — EXTRACT — because it appears to be a typographic error.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➤ The entire claim should be amended to —

An apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext, targeting a hypertext database~~ link in a database, said apparatus capable of detecting a ~~part including a~~ logically mismatched link ~~in said hypertext database~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➤ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a hypertext the link as set forth in claim 1, wherein said

apparatus operates is operated to detect at least one of the following parts as said part,

said parts including logically mismatched links:

- a part link having a mismatch between a link source description the hyperlink

  appearing on the source web page and contents of a link a target web page, said

  link target page being linked with said link source description;

- a part link having a mismatch between a link source description the hyperlink

  appearing on the source web page and contents of a link a target web page

  having expired content, the contents of said link target page being changed, said

  link target page being linked with said link source description;

- a part link on multiple web pages having a disunity among a plurality of link

  source descriptions having a same link target page an inconsistent hyperlink

  appearing on the multiple web pages;

- a part link having a disunity in styles among a plurality of link source descriptions

  different method of presenting an associated target web page than other links on

  the included in a same web page or peripheral pages in the same website;

- a ~~part~~ link having ~~no link source description~~ <u>a hyperlink that is not readily</u> <u>apparent to a user</u>; and

- a ~~part~~ link ~~including a group of links forming~~ <u>that forms</u> a loop[[,]] <u>with other links</u> ~~the link source descriptions of said links~~ relating to a ~~same~~ <u>similar</u> topic.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

An apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ <u>link,</u> comprising:

- an information storing unit which stores [[an]] information about links ~~related to~~

~~said hypertext~~; and

- a condition detecting unit which ~~refers to said information storing unit to~~ detect<u>s</u> a

~~part including~~ a logically mismatched link.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 3, further comprising an

information collecting unit which collects said information about the links ~~related to said~~

~~hypertext~~, wherein said information storing unit stores said information about the links

collected by said information collecting unit.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 3, further comprising a

candidate providing unit which provides a correction candidate related to ~~said part~~

~~including~~ the logically mismatched link detected by said condition detecting unit.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 5, further comprising a

correction reflecting unit which corrects ~~said hypertext based on said part including~~ the

logically mismatched link ~~detected by said condition detecting unit and said correction candidate provided by said correction providing unit~~.

> — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms to United States patent practice.

Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ <u>link</u> as set forth in claim 3, wherein said condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ divide<u>s</u> said information about the links into ~~some~~ groups in accordance with a predetermined condition and detects a ~~minor~~ <u>subgroup</u> <u>of</u> <u>the groups</u> ~~as said part including~~ <u>that includes</u> the logically mismatched link.

> — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms to United States patent practice.

Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ <u>link</u> as set forth in claim 3, wherein said condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ detect<u>s</u> ~~a part including~~ a link <u>having a mismatch</u> <u>between</u> ~~of which a link source description~~ <u>the link</u> and ~~contents of a link~~ <u>a</u> target <u>web</u> page ~~are mismatched as said part including the logically mismatched link~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 3, wherein said

condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ calculate<u>s</u> criteria scores of the links based on at

least one of the following scores and detects [[a]] <u>the</u> link with [[a]] <u>the</u> high<u>est</u> criteria

score[[s]] as said ~~part~~ <u>logically mismatched link</u>, said scores including:

- a first score calculated by comparing ~~link source descriptions of a plurality of~~ <u>the</u>

  <u>hyper</u>links <u>of links</u> having [[a]] <u>the</u> same ~~link~~ target <u>web</u> page ~~with each other~~;

- a second score calculated by comparing ~~link~~ <u>the</u> target <u>web</u> pages of ~~a plurality~~

  ~~of~~ links having ~~a same link source description with each other~~ <u>identical</u>

  <u>hyperlinks</u>;

- a third score calculated by comparing ~~link~~ <u>the</u> target <u>web</u> pages of a plurality of

  links having [[a]] <u>the</u> same ~~link target~~ <u>source web</u> page and ~~a same link source~~

  ~~description with each other~~ <u>identical hyperlinks</u>; and

- a fourth score calculated by comparing contents of a ~~link source description~~

  <u>hyperlink</u> and contents of a ~~link~~ target <u>web</u> page~~, said link source description~~

  ~~being linked with said link target page~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

> The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 3, wherein said

condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ detects a ~~part~~ link having a mismatch between ~~a~~

~~link source description~~ the hyperlink appearing on the source web page and ~~contents of~~

~~a link~~ a target web page having expired content~~, said link source description being~~

~~linked with said link target page, and said mismatch being caused by changing the~~

~~contents of said link target page~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities:

> The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 3, wherein said

condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ calculates criteria scores of the links based on at

least one of the following scores and [[to]] detects [[a]] the link with [[a]] the highest

criteria score[[s]] as said ~~part~~ logically mismatched link, said scores including:

- a first score calculated by comparing ~~link source descriptions of a plurality of~~ the hyperlinks <u>of links</u> having [[a]] <u>the</u> same ~~link~~ target <u>web</u> page ~~with each other~~;

- a second score calculated by detecting a notice ~~description~~<u>,</u> including a movement notice ~~description~~ or an expiration notice ~~description~~<u>,</u> ~~included~~ in the contents of a ~~link~~ target <u>web</u> page <u>for an associated link</u>; and

- a third score calculated by detecting a ~~description of~~ period of validity ~~included~~ in the contents of a ~~link~~ target <u>web</u> page <u>for an associated link</u> and comparing said period of validity ~~and~~ <u>to the</u> present date and time.

   — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms to United States patent practice.

   Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➤ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ <u>link</u> as set forth in claim 3, wherein said condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ detect<u>s</u> a ~~part~~ <u>link on multiple web pages</u> having a ~~disunity among a plurality of link source descriptions having a same link target page~~ <u>an inconsistent hyperlink appearing on the multiple web pages</u>.

   — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms to United States patent practice.

Claim 17 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 3, wherein said

condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ detects a ~~part~~ link having a ~~disunity in styles~~

~~among a plurality of link source descriptions~~ different method of presenting an

associated target web page than other links on the ~~included in a~~ same web page or

~~peripheral pages~~ in the same website.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 5, wherein said

condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ divides said information about the links into ~~some~~

groups including a major group and a minor group in accordance with a predetermined

condition and detects said minor group as ~~said part~~ including the logically mismatched

link.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 19 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 18, wherein said

candidate providing unit ~~is operated to~~ provide<u>s</u> a correction candidate that makes said

minor group ~~same as~~ <u>conform to</u> said ~~main~~ <u>major</u> group.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 5, wherein said

condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ detect<u>s</u> ~~a part including~~ a link <u>having a mismatch</u>

<u>between</u> ~~of which a link source description~~ <u>the link</u> and ~~contents of a link~~ <u>a</u> target <u>web</u>

<u>page</u> ~~are mismatched as said part including the logically mismatched link~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 5, wherein said

condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ calculate<u>s</u> criteria scores of the links based on at

least one of the following scores and detects [[a]] <u>the</u> link with [[a]] <u>the</u> high<u>est</u> criteria

score[[s]] as said ~~part~~ <u>logically mismatched link</u>, said scores including:

- a first score calculated by comparing ~~link source descriptions of a plurality of~~ <u>the</u>

   <u>hyper</u>links <u>of links</u> having [[a]] <u>the</u> same ~~link~~ target <u>web</u> page ~~with each other~~;

- a second score calculated by comparing ~~link~~ <u>the</u> target <u>web</u> pages of ~~a plurality~~

   ~~of~~ links having ~~a same link source description with each other~~ <u>identical</u>

   <u>hyperlinks</u>;

- a third score calculated by comparing ~~link~~ <u>the</u> target <u>web</u> pages of a plurality of

   links having a same ~~link target~~ <u>source web</u> page and ~~a same link source~~

   ~~description with each other~~ <u>identical hyperlinks</u>; and

- a fourth score calculated by comparing contents of a ~~link source description~~

   <u>hyperlink</u> and contents of a ~~link~~ target <u>web</u> page~~, said link source description~~

   ~~being linked with said link target page~~.

   — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

   claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

   to United States patent practice.

   Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 21, wherein said candidate providing unit ~~is operated to~~ provides at least one of the following correction candidates including:

- a first correction candidate for ~~the link source description~~ hyperlinks obtained by comparing ~~link source descriptions of a plurality of~~ the hyperlinks of links having [[a]] the same ~~link~~ target web page ~~with each other~~;

- a second correction for ~~the link target candidate~~ target web pages obtained by comparing the target web pages of ~~a plurality of~~ links having ~~a same link source description with each other~~ identical hyperlinks;

- a correction candidate for ~~the link~~ target web pages obtained by comparing ~~link~~ the target web pages of ~~a plurality of~~ links having [[a]] the same ~~link target~~ source web page and ~~a same link source description with each other~~ identical hyperlinks; and

- a correction candidate for ~~the link source description~~ hyperlinks obtained by comparing contents of a ~~link source description~~ hyperlink and contents of a ~~link~~ target web page~~, said link source description being linked with said link target page~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms to United States patent practice.

Claim 23 is objected to because of the following informalities:

> The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 5, wherein said

condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ detects a ~~part~~ link having a mismatch between a

~~link source description~~ the hyperlink appearing on the source web page and ~~contents of~~

~~a link~~ a target web page having expired content, ~~said link source description being~~

~~linked with said link target page, and said mismatch being caused by changing the~~

~~contents of said link target page~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 24 is objected to because of the following informalities:

> The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 5, wherein said

condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ calculates criteria scores of the links based on at

least one of the following scores and detects [[a]] the link with [[a]] the highest criteria

score[[s]] as said ~~part~~ logically mismatched link, said scores including:

• a first score calculated by comparing ~~link source descriptions of a plurality of~~ the

hyperlinks of links having [[a]] the same ~~link~~ target web page ~~with each other~~;

- a second score calculated by detecting a notice ~~description~~ including a movement notice ~~description~~ or an expiration notice ~~description~~ ~~included~~ in the contents of [[the]] a ~~link~~ target web page for an associated link; and

- a third score calculated by detecting a ~~description of~~ period of validity ~~included~~ in the contents of a ~~link~~ target web page for an associated link and comparing said period of validity ~~and~~ to the present date and time.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms to United States patent practice.

Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 24, wherein said candidate providing unit ~~is operated to~~ provides at least one of the following correction candidates including:

- a first correction candidate for ~~the link source description~~ hyperlinks obtained by comparing ~~link source descriptions of a plurality of~~ the hyperlinks of links having [[a]] the same ~~link~~ target web page ~~with each other~~; and

- a second correction candidate for ~~the link~~ target web pages obtained by extracting ~~the description of~~ a new ~~moved~~ web page address from the contents of [[a]] the ~~link~~ target web page.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 26 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➤ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 5, wherein said

condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ detects a ~~part~~ link on multiple web pages having a

~~disunity among a plurality of link source descriptions having a same link target page~~ an

inconsistent hyperlink appearing on the multiple web pages, and said candidate

providing unit provides a correction candidate for the hyperlink ~~source description~~ by

comparing ~~link source descriptions of a plurality of~~ the hyperlinks ~~of links~~ having [[a]] the

same ~~link~~ target web page as that of said ~~part~~ detected link ~~by said condition detecting~~

~~unit~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 27 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➤ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 5, wherein said

condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ detects a ~~part~~ link having a ~~disunity in styles~~

~~among a plurality of link source descriptions~~ different method of presenting an

associated target web page than other links on the ~~included in a~~ same web page or

~~peripheral pages~~ in the same website, and said candidate providing unit ~~is operated to~~

provides said correction candidate for the ~~style of the link source description~~ detected

link by comparing the ~~style of a plurality of link source descriptions included in the~~

~~detected part detected by said condition detecting unit~~ presentation method of the

detected link and the presentation methods of the other links.

> — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the
>
> claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms
>
> to United States patent practice.

Claim 28 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 4, wherein said

information collecting unit ~~is operated to~~ repeatedly collects said information about the

links ~~in the hypertext~~, and said information storing unit stores ~~a plurality of~~ said

information ~~about the links~~ collected at ~~a plurality of~~ different times.

> — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the
>
> claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms
>
> to United States patent practice.

Claim 29 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➤ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 28, wherein said

condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ detects a ~~part~~ link having a mismatch between ~~a~~

~~link source description~~ the hyperlink appearing on the source web page and ~~contents of~~

~~a link~~ a target web page by ~~referring to~~ analyzing said information ~~storing unit~~ and

~~calculating~~ determining ~~changes of~~ a change in the number[[s]] of [[the]] links ~~or kinds of~~

~~the link source description to the link target page~~ during said times, ~~the contents of said~~

~~link target page being changed~~.

> — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the
>
> claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms
>
> to United States patent practice.

Claim 30 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➤ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 3, wherein said

condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ detects a link having no ~~link source description~~

hyperlink appearing on the source web page as ~~said part including~~ the logically

mismatched link.

> — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the
>
> claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms
>
> to United States patent practice.

Claim 31 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 3, wherein said

condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ detect<u>s</u> a link having ~~the link source description~~ <u>a</u>

<u>hyperlink on the source web page</u> in which no character strings or images are included,

or ~~a link having the link source description~~ in which a character string or an image <u>is</u>

expressed in an inconspicuous color or [[a]] size ~~is included~~, as ~~said part including~~ the

logically mismatched link.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 3, wherein said

condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ detect<u>s</u> a group of links <u>having associated</u>

<u>hyperlinks appearing on source web pages that</u> ~~forming~~ <u>forms</u> a loop as said ~~part~~

logically mismatched link, <u>wherein</u> the ~~link source descriptions of said links~~ <u>associated</u>

<u>hyperlinks</u> ~~relating~~ <u>relate</u> to a ~~same~~ <u>common</u> topic.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 35 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The apparatus for checking a ~~hypertext~~ link as set forth in claim 4, wherein said

information collecting unit ~~is operated to~~ extracts character strings corresponding to ~~the~~

~~link source description~~ hyperlinks of said links [[by]] through character recognition when

the ~~link source description is an~~ hyperlinks are images[[,]] and [[to]] resisters said

extracted character strings as said information about links [[on]] in said information

storing unit.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 38 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

A method of checking a ~~hypertext~~ link in a database comprising the steps of:

• accepting a condition for detecting a ~~part from a hypertext database~~ link, said

~~part~~ link including ~~a part having an error or~~ a mismatch in ~~a link source~~

~~description~~ an associated hyperlink appearing on the source web page ~~or a~~

~~relationship between links~~;

• detecting said ~~part~~ link based on said condition;

• displaying, on a display screen, a result of the detection as a list with three items

including:

- o ~~a link source description~~ <u>the associated hyperlink</u>;

- o identification information about ~~a link~~ <u>the</u> source <u>web</u> page; and

- o identification information about a ~~link~~ target <u>web</u> page <u>of said link</u>.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 39 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The method of checking a ~~hypertext~~ <u>link in a database</u> as set forth in claim 38, wherein

said list is sorted by having one of said three items as a key ~~in said step (c)~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 40 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The method of checking a ~~hypertext~~ <u>link in a database</u> as set forth in claim 38 further

comprising the steps of:

- • accepting a correction candidate for said three items; and

- • correcting said ~~hyper text database~~ <u>link</u> in accordance with said correction

    candidate ~~accepted in said step (d)~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 41 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The method of checking a ~~hypertext~~ link in a database as set forth in claim 38, further

comprising the step of specifying a ~~hypertext~~ database ~~to be checked~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 45 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

A computer program product comprising a computer usable storage medium having

computer readable code embodied ~~therein~~ thereon, said computer readable code being

executed by a computer including an information storing unit which stores [[an]]

information about links ~~related to a hypertext, said computer readable code including a~~

~~cord for having said computer serve as~~ and a condition detecting unit which ~~refers to~~

~~said information storing unit to~~ detects ~~a part including~~ a logically mismatched link.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 46 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

A computer program product comprising a computer usable storage medium having

computer readable code embodied therein thereon, said computer readable code being

executed by a computer having an information storing unit, said computer readable

code including a cord for having causing said computer to serve as:

- an information collecting unit which collects [[an]] information about links related

  to a hypertext and stores said information on said information storing unit; and

- a condition detecting unit which refers to said information storing unit to detects a

  part including a logically mismatched link.

  — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

  claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

  to United States patent practice.

Claim 47 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 46, wherein said computer readable

code includes a cord for having causing said computer to serve as a candidate

providing unit which provides a correction candidate related to ~~said part including~~ the

logically mismatched link detected by said condition detecting unit.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 49 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 47, wherein said computer readable

code ~~includes a cord for having~~ causing said computer to serve as a correction

reflecting unit which corrects ~~said hypertext based on said part including~~ the logically

mismatched link ~~detected by said condition detecting unit and said correction candidate~~

~~provided by said correction providing unit~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 53 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 45, wherein said condition detecting

unit ~~is operated to~~ divides said information about the links into ~~some~~ groups in

accordance with a predetermined condition and detects a ~~minor~~ sub<u>group</u> <u>of the groups</u> ~~as said part including~~ <u>that includes</u> the logically mismatched link.

> — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms to United States patent practice.

Claim 54 is objected to because of the following informalities:

> ➤ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 45, <u>wherein</u> said condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ detect<u>s</u> ~~a part including~~ a link <u>having a mismatch between</u> ~~of which a link source description~~ <u>the link</u> and ~~contents of a link~~ <u>a</u> target <u>web</u> page ~~are mismatched as said part including the logically mismatched link~~.

> — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms to United States patent practice.

Claim 55 is objected to because of the following informalities:

> ➤ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 45, wherein said condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ calculate<u>s</u> criteria scores of the links based on at least one of the following scores and detects [[a]] <u>the</u> link with [[a]] <u>the</u> high<u>est</u> criteria score[[s]] as said ~~part~~ <u>logically mismatched link</u>, said scores including:

- a first score calculated by comparing ~~link source descriptions of a plurality of~~ the hyperlinks of links having [[a]] the same ~~link~~ target web page ~~with each other~~;

- a second score calculated by comparing ~~link~~ the target web pages of ~~a plurality of~~ links having ~~a same link source description with each other~~ identical hyperlinks;

- a third score calculated by comparing ~~link~~ the target web pages of a plurality of links having [[a]] the same ~~link target~~ source web page and ~~a same link source description with each other~~ identical hyperlinks; and

- a fourth score calculated by comparing contents of a ~~link source description~~ hyperlink and contents of a ~~link~~ target web page~~, said link source description being linked with said link target page~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms to United States patent practice.

Claim 56 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 45, wherein said condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ detects a ~~part~~ link having a mismatch between ~~a link source description~~ the hyperlink appearing on the source web page and ~~contents of a link~~ a target web page having expired content~~, said link source description being linked with~~

~~said link target page, and said mismatch being caused by changing the contents of said~~

~~link target page~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 57 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 45, wherein said condition detecting

unit ~~is operated to~~ calculates criteria scores of the links based on at least one of the

following scores and [[to]] detects [[a]] the link with [[a]] the highest criteria score[[s]] as

said ~~part~~ logically mismatched link, said scores including:

- a first score calculated by comparing ~~link source descriptions of a plurality of~~ the

  hyperlinks of links having [[a]] the same ~~link~~ target web page ~~with each other~~;

- a second score calculated by detecting a notice ~~description~~ including a

  movement notice ~~description~~ or an expiration notice ~~description~~ included in the

  contents of a ~~link~~ target web page for an associated link; and

- a third score calculated by detecting a ~~description of~~ period of validity ~~included~~ in

  the contents of a ~~link~~ target web page for an associated link and comparing said

  period of validity ~~and~~ to the present date and time.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 58 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 45, wherein said condition detecting

unit is operated to detects a part link on multiple web pages having a disunity among a

plurality of link source descriptions having a same link target page an inconsistent

hyperlink appearing on the multiple web pages.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 59 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 45, wherein said condition detecting

unit is operated to detects a part link having a disunity in styles among a plurality of link

source descriptions different method of presenting an associated target web page than

other links on the included in a same web page or peripheral pages in the same

website.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms to United States patent practice.

Claim 60 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 47, wherein said condition detecting unit is operated to divides said information about the links into some groups including a major group and a minor group in accordance with a predetermined condition and detects said minor group as said part including the logically mismatched link.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms to United States patent practice.

Claim 61 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 60, wherein said candidate providing unit is operated to provides a correction candidate that makes said minor group same as conform to said main major group.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms to United States patent practice.

Claim 62 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 47, wherein said condition detecting

unit ~~is operated to~~ detect_s_ ~~a part including~~ a link having a mismatch between ~~of which a~~

~~link source description~~ the link and ~~contents of a link~~ a target web page ~~are mismatched~~

~~as said part including the logically mismatched link~~.

> — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the
>
> claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms
>
> to United States patent practice.

Claim 63 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 47, wherein said condition detecting

unit ~~is operated to~~ calculate_s_ criteria scores of the links based on at least one of the

following scores and detects [[a]] the link with [[a]] the high_est_ criteria score[[s]] as said

~~part~~ logically mismatched link, said scores including:

- a first score calculated by comparing ~~link source descriptions of a plurality of~~ the

  hyperlinks of links having [[a]] the same ~~link~~ target web page ~~with each other~~;

- a second score calculated by comparing ~~link~~ the target web pages of ~~a plurality~~

  ~~of~~ links having ~~a same link source description with each other~~ identical

  hyperlinks;

- a third score calculated by comparing ~~link~~ the target web pages of a plurality of links having a same ~~link target~~ source web page and ~~a same link source description with each other~~ identical hyperlinks; and

- a fourth score calculated by comparing contents of a ~~link source description~~ hyperlink and contents of a ~~link~~ target web page~~, said link source description being linked with said link target page~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms to United States patent practice.

Claim 64 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➤ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 63, wherein said candidate providing unit ~~is operated to~~ provides at least one of the following correction candidates including:

- a first correction candidate for ~~the link source description~~ hyperlinks obtained by comparing ~~link source descriptions of a plurality of~~ the hyperlinks of links having [[a]] the same ~~link~~ target web page ~~with each other~~;

- a second correction for ~~the link target candidate~~ target web pages obtained by comparing the target web pages of ~~a plurality of~~ links having ~~a same link source description with each other~~ identical hyperlinks;

- a correction candidate for ~~the link~~ target <u>web pages</u> obtained by comparing ~~link~~ <u>the</u> target <u>web</u> pages of ~~a plurality of~~ links having [[a]] <u>the</u> same ~~link target~~ <u>source web</u> page and ~~a same link source description with each other~~ <u>identical hyperlinks</u>; and

- a correction candidate for ~~the link source description~~ <u>hyperlinks</u> obtained by comparing contents of a ~~link source description~~ <u>hyperlink</u> and contents of a ~~link~~ target <u>web</u> page~~, said link source description being linked with said link target page~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms to United States patent practice.

Claim 65 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 47, wherein said condition detecting unit ~~is operated to~~ detects a ~~part~~ <u>link</u> having a mismatch between ~~a link source description~~ <u>the hyperlink appearing on the source web page</u> and ~~contents of a link~~ <u>a</u> target <u>web</u> page <u>having expired content</u>~~, said link source description being linked with said link target page, and said mismatch being caused by changing the contents of said link target page~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 66 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 47, wherein said condition detecting

unit is operated to calculates criteria scores of the links based on at least one of the

following scores and detects [[a]] the link with [[a]] the highest criteria score[[s]] as said

part logically mismatched link, said scores including:

- a first score calculated by comparing link source descriptions of a plurality of the

  hyperlinks of links having [[a]] the same link target web page with each other;

- a second score calculated by detecting a notice description, including a

  movement notice description or an expiration notice description, included in the

  contents of [[the]] a link target web page for an associated link; and

- a third score calculated by detecting a description of period of validity included in

  the contents of a link target web page for an associated link and comparing said

  period of validity and to the present date and time.

  — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

  claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

  to United States patent practice.

Claim 67 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 66, wherein said candidate

providing unit ~~is operated to~~ provides at least one of the following correction candidates

including:

- a first correction candidate for ~~the link source description~~ hyperlinks obtained by

  comparing ~~link source descriptions of a plurality of~~ the hyperlinks of links having

  [[a]] the same ~~link~~ target web page ~~with each other~~; and

- a second correction candidate for ~~the link~~ target web pages obtained by

  extracting ~~the description of~~ a new ~~moved~~ web page address from the contents

  of [[a]] the ~~link~~ target web page.

  — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

  claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

  to United States patent practice.

Claim 68 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 47, wherein said condition detecting

unit ~~is operated to~~ detects a ~~part~~ link on multiple web pages having ~~a disunity among a~~

~~plurality of link source descriptions having a same link target page~~ an inconsistent

hyperlink appearing on the multiple web pages, and said candidate providing unit

provides a correction candidate for the hyperlink ~~source description~~ by comparing ~~link~~

~~source descriptions of a plurality of~~ the hyperlinks of links having [[a]] the same ~~link~~

target web page as that of said ~~part~~ detected link ~~by said condition detecting unit~~.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 69 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➢ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 47, wherein said condition detecting

unit ~~is operated to~~ detects a ~~part~~ link having a ~~disunity in styles among a plurality of link~~

~~source descriptions~~ different method of presenting an associated target web page than

other links on the ~~included in a~~ same web page or ~~peripheral pages~~ in the same

website, and said candidate providing unit ~~is operated to~~ provides said correction

candidate for the ~~style of the link source description~~ detected link by comparing the ~~style~~

~~of a plurality of link source descriptions included in the detected part detected by said~~

~~condition detecting unit~~ presentation method of the detected link and the presentation

methods of the other links.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 70 is objected to because of the following informalities:

> The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 46, wherein said information

collecting unit is operated to repeatedly collects said information about the links in the

hypertext, and said information storing unit stores a plurality of said information about

the links collected at a plurality of different times.

> — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 71 is objected to because of the following informalities:

> The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 70, wherein said condition detecting

unit is operated to detects a part link having a mismatch between a link source

description the hyperlink appearing on the source web page and contents of a link a

target web page by referring to analyzing said information storing unit and calculating

determining changes of a change in the number[[s]] of [[the]] links or kinds of the link

source description to the link target page during said times, the contents of said link

target page being changed.

> — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 72 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➤ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 45, wherein said condition detecting

unit is operated to detects a link having no link source description hyperlink appearing

on the source web page as said part including the logically mismatched link.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 73 is objected to because of the following informalities:

➤ The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 45, wherein said condition detecting

unit is operated to detects a link having the link source description a hyperlink on the

source web page in which no character strings or images are included, or a link having

the link source description in which a character string or an image is expressed in an

inconspicuous color or [[a]] size is included, as said part including the logically

mismatched link.

— in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

to United States patent practice.

Claim 74 is objected to because of the following informalities:

> The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 45, wherein said condition detecting

unit is operated to detects a group of links having associated hyperlinks appearing on

source web pages that forming forms a loop as said part logically mismatched link,

wherein the link source descriptions of said links associated hyperlinks relating relate to

a same common topic.

> — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

> claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

> to United States patent practice.

Claim 77 is objected to because of the following informalities:

> The entire claim should be amended to —

The computer program product as set forth in claim 46, wherein said information

collecting unit is operated to extracts character strings corresponding to the link source

description hyperlinks of said links [[by]] through character recognition when the link

source description is an hyperlinks are images[[,]] and [[to]] resisters said extracted

character strings as said information about links [[on]] in said information storing unit.

> — in order to more accurately describe Applicant's invention and so that the

> claim reads easily for a person whose native language is English and conforms

> to United States patent practice.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-5, 7, 11-32, 35-37, 45, 53-59, 72-74 and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 and 2:

The language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that would not result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

In summary, Claim 1 recites an *"apparatus"* for checking links for "mismatches." The *"apparatus"* is comprised solely of computer software components. Thus, the recited invention is computer software *per se.*

A computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer. The computer program itself is not a statutory process in that it does not include the computer-readable medium needed to realize the functionality of the computer program. Thus, as currently recited, Claim 1 is directed to an abstract idea that does not produce a concrete, useful and tangible result.

Claim 2 merely recites additional computer software components. Thus, Claim 2 also fails to recite statutory subject matter.

Additionally, in order for a claim to recite statutory subject matter, the claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application by producing a useful, concrete and tangible result. *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc.*, 149 F. 3d 1368, 1373, 47 USPQ2d 1596, 1601-02 (Fed. Cir. 1998). The sole function of the "*apparatus*," as recited in Claims 1-2, is checking links. "Checking links" is an abstract idea that does not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result. Stated differently, the recited invention merely checks links without doing anything more to the links.

Claims 3-5, 7, 11-32 and 35-37:

The language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that would not result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

In summary, Claim 3 recites an "*apparatus*" for checking a link by storing information about links and using the information to detect a "logically mismatched link." The "*apparatus*" is comprised solely of computer software components. Thus, the recited invention is computer software *per se*.

A computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer. The computer program itself is not a statutory process in that it does not include the computer-readable medium needed to realize the functionality of the computer program. Thus, as currently recited, Claim 3 is directed to an abstract idea that does not produce a concrete, useful and tangible result.

Claims 4, 5, 7, 11-32 and 35-37 merely recite additional computer software components. Thus, Claims 4, 5, 7, 11-32 and 35-37 also fail to recite statutory subject matter.

Additionally, in order for a claim to recite statutory subject matter, the claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application by producing a useful, concrete and tangible result. *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc.*, 149 F. 3d 1368, 1373, 47 USPQ2d 1596, 1601-02 (Fed. Cir. 1998). The sole function of the "*apparatus*," as recited in Claims 3, 5, 11-32, 36 and 37, is checking a link by monitoring conditions, manipulating data and calculating scores. None of these functions performed by the software yield a tangible result in that the functions performed by the software stop short of a practical application (unlike Claim 4, which *collects* information about the links and *stores* the information, and Claim 7, which *corrects* the links).

Claims 45, 53-59, 72-74 and 78:

The language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that would not result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

In order for a claim to recite statutory subject matter, the claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application by producing a useful, concrete and tangible result. *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc.*, 149 F. 3d 1368, 1373, 47 USPQ2d 1596, 1601-02 (Fed. Cir. 1998). The sole function of the "*computer program product*," as recited in Claims 45, 53-59, 72-74 and 78, is checking a link by monitoring conditions, manipulating data and calculating scores. None of these functions performed by the software yield a tangible result in that the functions performed by the software stop short of a practical application (unlike Claim 46, which **collects** information about the links and **stores** the information, and Claim 49, which **corrects** the links).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-5, 7, 11-32, 35-41, 45-47, 49, 53-74 and 77-79 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and

distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-5, 7, 11-32, 35-41, 45-47, 49, 53-74 and 77-79:

Claim 1 recites *"detecting a part including a logically mismatched link in said*

hypertext database" in Lines 2-3. This limitation is indefinite because, while it is clear

that the recited invention "detects" a *"logically mismatched link,"* it is unclear what is

meant by the phrase *"detecting a __part__ including a logically mismatched link in said*

hypertext database." It is clear that the *"part"* includes the *"logically mismatched link,"*

and it is clear that the *"part"* is *"in said hypertext database;"* however, it is unclear

whether the *"part"* is a hyperlink, a web page, a website or something else contained

within the *"hypertext database."* The term *"part"* is not well-defined in the Specification.

The only portion of the Specification that indicates a meaning of the term is on Page 23,

Lines 23-27, which indicates that the *"part"* is in a document and is logically

mismatched.

Because the examiner cannot determine the meaning of *"part,"* the scope of

Claim 1 cannot be determined. Thus, Claim 1 is indefinite.

To properly response to this issue, Applicant must amend the claim to

particularly point out and **distinctly claim** the subject matter which Applicant regards

as the invention.

Claims 3 (see Lines 5-6), 38 (see Lines 2-5), 45 (see Line 8) and 46 (see Lines 10-11) have the same limitation. Thus, Claims 3, 38, 45 and 46 are indefinite using the same rationale.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 11-32, 35-37 39-41, 47, 49, 53-74 and 77-79 are dependent upon Claims 1, 3, 38 or 46, and thus incorporate the indefinite subject matter in the aforementioned rejections.

Claim 2:

Claim 2 recites "*a part having a mismatch between a link source description and contents of a link target page, the contents of said link target page being changed, said link target page being linked with said link source description*" in Lines 7-10. This limitation is indefinite because it is unclear **whether** the changed "*contents*" of the "*link target page*" causes the "*mismatch.*" If the changed "*contents*" of the "*link target page*" **does** cause the "*mismatch,*" then the limitation is indefinite also because it is unclear **how** the changed "*contents*" of the "*link target page*" causes the "*mismatch.*"

This limitation is nearly identical to the limitation recited in Lines 4-6, with the only difference being the changed "*contents.*" This limitation insufficiently indicates how the changed "*contents*" relates to the remainder of the limitation. Thus, the scope of the claimed invention cannot be determined.

To properly response to this issue, Applicant must amend the claim to *particularly point out* and *distinctly claim* the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 13, 21, 22, 55, 63 and 64:

Claim 13 recites "*a third score calculated by comparing link target pages of a plurality of links having a same link target page and a same link source description with each other*" in Lines 12-14. This limitation is indefinite because it is unclear *to what* the "*link target pages*" (see Line 12) are being "*compared.*" The limitation recites that the "*plurality of links*" have the same "*link target page*" (see Line 13). Thus, it appears that the recited invention is comparing a single "*link target page*" to itself. "*Comparing*" a single web page to itself makes no sense to the examiner.

To properly response to this issue, Applicant must amend the claim to *particularly point out* and *distinctly claim* the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 21 (see Lines 12-14), 22 (see Lines 11-14), 55 (see Lines 12-14), 63 (see Lines 12-14) and 64 (see Lines 12-15) have the same limitation. Thus, Claims 21, 22, 55, 63 and 64 are indefinite using the same rationale.

Claims 36, 37, 78 and 79:

Each of Claims 36, 37, 78 and 79 recite "*having a hypertext on a Web site **to be**

checked target"* (emphasis added). This limitation is indefinite because its grammar

makes the scope of the limitation indeterminable. That is, the examiner cannot

determine the scope of the limitation because the limitation is not recited in idiomatic

English. Additionally, the examiner cannot determine what a "*checked target*" is,

because the Specification of the present invention does not mention a "*checked target.*"

If Applicant opts to keep this language in the claim, then Applicant should expressly

indicate the meaning of "*checked target*" and provide the location in the Specification

(page and line number) where Applicant's interpretation of "*checked target*" is

supported.

To properly response to this issue, Applicant must amend the claims to

particularly point out and **distinctly claim** the subject matter which Applicant regards

as the invention.

Complete Substantive Examination Delayed

Based on the indefiniteness of the claims and the problems with the Specification

and format of the claims, the examiner deems it impractical to give a complete

substantive examination at this time. However, the examiner has performed a search to

locate the best prior art in the context of the present invention as he best understands it.

These references are listed on the Form 892 attached to this Office Action.

Also, the examiner submits the following comments regarding the present

invention and the references. Applicant may used these comments for assistance in

forwarding prosecution of the application.

Claims 1-3 and 45 are much too broad and will never be allowed in their present

state. The term "*part*" should be amended in every instance in the claims so that the

examiner can determine the scope of the claimed invention. In other words, if the "*part*"

is a link (or a target web page), then it should be identified as a link (or a target web

page)in the claims.

The closest references listed on Form 892 to Applicant's invention are: Davis-

Hall, U.S. Patent No. 6,601,066; Bates et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No.

US 2002/0133514; Diedrich et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,028,032; McCarty et al., U.S.

Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0205569; Lal, U.S. Patent Application

Publication No. US 2003/0158953; Hayden, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US

2003/0084095; and Laiho, WO 00/46696.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is 571-272-4137.
The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone
number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-
273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

WDH
July 9, 2006

DOUG HUTTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100